



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,332	08/17/2001	Kevin Scott Goldsmith	TUC920010024US1	4192

24033 7590 03/31/2005

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

DAS, CHAMELI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2192

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/932,332	Applicant(s) GOLDSMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner CHAMELI C. DAS	Art Unit 2192	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-54.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The argument is not persuasive. The applicant argued in substance that Cobb (US 5,119,377) does not disclose the limitation "accesses error information associated with the identifier and generates error information describing a specific cause of the error that caused the test operation failed". The Examiner believed that the above limitation was taught by Cobb (US 5, 119, 377). In abstract lines 7-10, Cobb teaches that "error detection code" accesses the Application Data Table (ADT). The ADT contains the error information associated with the identifier (Col 7, lines 55-58, "An identification of the problem program 30 that detected the error. This information is taken from the application data header entry 11 in the Application Data Table (ADT)"), generates the error information (col 4, lines 9-11, "the format of the error log record generated by the Early Detection Data Capture process") and (col 4 lines 23-28, "The EDDC process requires construction of a table which will be referred to as the Application Data Table (ADT). Its entries contain detailed information about the problem program and are selected by the error detection code as parameters on the call to the EDDC process. The EDDC process uses this table information to generate a dump of specific program storage areas, to create an entry in a software error log and to build a software generic alert"), describing a specific cause of the error that caused the test operation to fail (col 10, lines 7-8, "errcatgy" is the category of the failure (e.g., permanent, temporary, unknown) and (col 10, lines 40-41, "causecp" is a two-byte hexadecimal code point that identifies the cause of the failure").

The applicant argued that Kidder (US 6,708,291) reference does not teach the deficiencies of the Cobb reference. The applicant does not specifically point out which limitation was not taught by Kidder. Examiner believes that the limitations of claims 15, 30 and 50 were taught by Cobb and Kidder. See the rejections in the previous office action.

Chameli C. Das
CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

3/29/05